

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VYACHESLAV SHIROKOV, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

YAN ARDATOVSKIY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-02701-EMC

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' EX
PARTE MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER WITHOUT
PREJUDICE**

Docket No. 9

Currently pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' ex parte motion for relief. Plaintiffs ask for a temporary restraining order ("TRO"), expedited discovery, and permission to serve by alternative means. The motion is **DENIED**, in its entirety, without prejudice. Plaintiffs have failed to provide a sufficient justification to proceed ex parte, especially as Defendants are already aware of the dispute with Plaintiffs in light of (1) takedown notices that Plaintiffs have issued to third parties and (2) correspondence that Plaintiffs' counsel has had with defense counsel.

The Court also notes that it is not appropriate for Plaintiffs to seek relief on an emergency basis for all relief sought. There is, in particular, no need for the issues of expedited discovery and alternative service to be a part of the motion for a TRO. This ruling does not bar Plaintiffs from seeking discovery prior to the Rule 26(f) conference but discovery is a matter for which they should meet and confer with Defendants first. In addition, it makes sense for Plaintiffs to meet and confer with Defendants regarding means of service as such a discussion might make a motion for alternative service moot.

///


///

1 Although the Court is denying Plaintiffs' motion in its entirety, it does not bar them from
2 filing a motion for a TRO with notice to Defendants and/or a motion for preliminary injunction.

3 This order disposes of Docket No. 9.

4
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: March 28, 2025

8
9
10 
11 EDWARD M. CHEN
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28